



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/665,763	09/18/2003	Rupert Seidlein	I	6376
7590 02/09/2009 HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C. P.O. Box 8910 Reston, VA 20195				
EXAMINER LIPMAN, JACOB				
ART UNIT 2434		PAPER NUMBER		
MAIL DATE 02/09/2009		DELIVERY MODE PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Interview Summary

Application No.

10/665,763

Applicant(s)

SEIDLEIN, RUPERT

Examiner

JACOB LIPMAN

Art Unit

2434

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) JACOB LIPMAN.

(3) _____.

(2) Edward Smith.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 03 February 2009.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal (copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Stewart.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The examiner and applicant discussed why the previously added limitation might be a 112 issue. The examiner pointed out that Stewart does not seem to discuss verifying that the device is within a proximity of the access terminal, or authenticating the user based on this information, and these might be the main differences between the art and the invention. Applicant indicated that they plan to respond with an amendment to highlight these differences.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Jacob Lipman/
Examiner, Art Unit 2434